

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 17, and 20 are currently amended to more clearly define pre-existing claim limitations. No claims are canceled. No claims are added. No new matter has been added.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 9-10, 15-16, 25-26, and 31-32 stand objected to as depending from a rejected independent claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all intervening claim limitations.

Claims 1-2, 4, 17-18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,402 to Fischer et al. (hereinafter "Fischer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,402 to Shariff et al. (hereinafter "Shariff").

Claims 3, 5-8, 11-14, 19, 21-24, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer and Shariff in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,623,697 to Bland et al. (hereinafter "Bland").

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4, 17-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Shariff. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because the combination of cited references fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claims.

CLAIMS 1-8, and 11-14

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Fischer. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference

because Fischer does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method, comprising:
 scanning an address space to locate a structure, wherein scanning the address space to locate the structure comprises scanning an identification register of the structure whose value matches a predetermined value, wherein the value of the identification register identifies a starting address location of the structure within the address space;
 determining the starting address location of the structure; and
 accessing a register located within the structure by adding a predetermined offset to the starting address location of the structure.
(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, requires scanning for an identification register of a device whose value matches a predetermined value, and that the identification register identifies a starting address of the structure within the address space.

Fischer is directed to a host (e.g., printer) that locates shareable resources on an accessory (e.g., I/O card) by using an offset mechanism on the accessory. Fischer, Abstract. Fischer discloses that firmware of the host (e.g., printer) is used to map the configuration address space of the peripheral (e.g., I/O card) to appear in the memory addressable area of the host, and the peripheral resources (e.g., Card Based Resources) to another area of the memory addressable area of the host. The peripheral resources are mapped to the memory of the host starting at the base address. See col. 4, lines 24-29. The mapping of the configuration address space and the resources of the peripheral allows the processor to virtually address them for reading, writing, and managing information to and from certain shared resources in the configuration address space and the resources of the peripheral. See col. 4, lines 29-36. Fischer, however, does not disclose scanning for an identification register of a device whose value matches a predetermined value, and that the identification register identifies a starting address location of the structure within the address space, as required by claim 1.

Shariff is directed to an interface controller for coupling along with other addressable interface modules over a communication bus to a central processor. Each interface module responds to a unique base address, responsive either to read commands or to write commands. (See Shariff, Abstract). The interface controller has a stored

configuration base address for use in determining the unique address for which the corresponding interface module is to respond. The stored configuration base address is automatically modified in the event the base address is the same as the unique base address for one of the other interface modules. (See Abstract, and col. 3, lines 38-41). Shariff is also directed to the means for modifying the stored configuration base address to a predetermined configuration address. (See Abstract).

Shariff discloses operations for reprogramming the identification code memory. However, the identification code memory is merely used to store a configuration byte that includes a memory base address. This memory base address can be modified for purposes of resolving memory conflicts. In particular, at system power up, the configuration byte from the ID memory is read in parallel to allow the BIOS to scan the ROM location for valid boot ROM. If the system properly boots up, the boot ROM initialization code then initializes its resources, replaces the desired interrupt vectors, and returns the system control back to system BIOS to complete its system initialization. However, if the system does not properly boot, it assumes there is a memory conflict. To resolve the memory conflict, the ID memory is reprogrammed. Shariff, however, does not disclose scanning for an identification register of a device whose value matches a predetermined value. Similarly, nothing in Shariff discloses that an identification register that identifies a starting address location of a structure within the address space.

Even if arguendo the combination of cited references were to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, the Office action does not provide a proper motivation to combine the references. The Office action purports that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the bus interface device of Fisher to have a step of scanning an address space to locate an identification register because it eliminates all memory base address conflicts. (See Office action, mailed November 15, 2006, page 4). The Applicant respectfully submits that such motivation is improper because scanning the address space is done in order to locate a structure, and in particular, to identify the starting address location of the structure within an address space, not to eliminate all memory base address conflicts. Accordingly, the Office action does not provide a proper motivation to combine the cited references.

For the reasons stated above, the combination of cited references fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Moreover, the claim is patentable over the cited

references because there is the Office Action fails to establish a motivation to combine the references. Given that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Given that claims 2-8, and 11-14 depend from independent claim 1, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-8, and 11-14 are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of claims 3, 5-8, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CLAIMS 17-24, and 27-30

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischer. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is patentable over the cited reference for reasons similar to those presented above with respect to claim 1.

Given that claims 18-24 and 27-30 depend from independent claim 17, which is patentable over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 18-24 and 27-30 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of claims 19, 21-24, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Michael Mallie at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 2/5/07



Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300